

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. Claims 1-23 stand rejected. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Objection to the Abstract

As discussed in the Examiner's interview, the Examiner agreed that the Abstract is to be used in determining the nature of the disclosure, rather than the invention. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the Abstract so that the United States Patent and Trademark Office and the public generally can more quickly determine from a cursory inspection the nature and gist of the technical disclosure. Support for the amendment is found, for example, in page 2, line 12 through line 19. No new matter has been added. Applicants request removal of the objection.

Objection to the Drawings

The Office Action stated that the drawings are objected to because it is unclear which drawing elements are being identified by the reference characters and lead lines from the following reference characters: 310, 320, 330, 410, 420, 430, 440, and 450. Reference number 440 has been amended in the specification (and accordingly shown in the revised drawings) as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants have provided replacement drawings with boxes surrounding the portion of text to which the reference characters refer. No new matter has been added. Applicants believe the objection to the drawings should be removed.

Objection to the Specification

The Office Action stated that the submission of the compact disc was defective. Applicants have resubmitted the compact disk in accordance with 37 CFR 1.96 with files in “.txt” format, which applicants believe to be in ASCII format. Additionally two labeled disks have been submitted using plastic covers. Applicants believe the objection to the amended specification should be removed.

Objection to the Claims

The Office Action objected to claims 2, 4, 15, 19, 21, and 22 because the term “richly formatted text” is not expressly defined in the specification. The claims have been amended to read “richly formatted content” as discussed, for example, in the paragraph starting on page 8, line 18. No new matter has been added. One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the term would at least include “Microsoft®’s rich text format” (as argued by the Office Action) and similar types of rich text formats. Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that richly formatted content can comprise text mixed with other content that can be richly formatted. Applicants believe the objections to the amended claims should be removed.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Office Action rejected claims 1, and 7-10 under 35 USC 102 (b) as being clearly anticipated by Ayers, I., “AbiWords’s Potential,” Linux gazette, Issue 43, July 1999, last downloaded by the Examiner on December 01, 2005, from:
www.linuxgazette.com/issue43/ayers.html, downloaded pages 1-4 (“Ayers”). In the response to

applicants' previous arguments, the Office Action recites "The most significant difference between AbiWord and nearly every other word processor available is the nature of the native file format. An *.abw file is written in XML and thus is also in ASCII format: the file can be read by any text editor." While the file can be read by any text editor, the text editor cannot parse or "understand" the XML code. Moreover, the text editors cannot determine the unique properties, map the determined properties, and store the mapped properties as recited by the claims.

With respect to claim 1, the claim has been amended to include inputting an application document that has been generated by an application that uses a file format that is specific to the application, wherein the file format is in a format that is native to the application and the file format comprises unique properties for describing fields within the document, wherein the unique properties are defined by the application. Thus features and properties can be added to the application used to author the document by enhancing the internal representation. By storing the document with the properties described in an ML, other applications (of other native MLs) can read the document to the extent they can understand the ML generated by the authoring application.

Accordingly, the recited invention of claim 1 (for example) can allow applications having native MLs to correctly process fields that are authored by an application having a different native ML (see page 6 of the specification). As discussed above, the cited art does not teach or suggest mapping unique application properties of a field to a markup language, but rather merely describes how to save files using XML using a specific format. Thus, the cited art does not show a computer-implemented method for representing field information in a markup language

document, where the field information has been mapped from a native file format as recited by the claims.

Moreover, the claim recites mapping the determined properties of the field into at least one of a markup language element, an attribute, and/or a value; and storing the properties of the field in the markup language document. Thus, the properties of the cited art are “read” (but not understood) by other word processors, and are not mapped and stored to an ML document as recited above. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 7-10 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given above for claim 1. Moreover, claim 8 is submitted to be allowable because Ayers does not teach or suggest processing further fields when the properties associated with all fields have not been stored in the markup language document. Instead, the auto-archive and save file functions saves the information in a file. The response to the applicants’ arguments states that claim 8 merely specifies completing the field storage process, which is the equivalent of storing the document. Applicants disagree because claim 1 as amended recites unique properties that are defined by the application. If claim 8 is so interpreted to be the equivalent of storing the document, the entire document would consist of unique properties that are defined by the application thereby excluding user inputted text, for example.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 2-6, 8, and 11-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayers, I., "AbiWord's Potential," Linux Gazette, Issue 43, July 1999, last

downloaded by the Examiner on December 20, 2005, from: www.linuxgazette.com/issue43/ayers.html. [hereinafter "Ayers"], in view of W3C, "XML Schema Part 0: Primer, W3C Recommendation, 2 May 2001," last downloaded by the Examiner on December 19, 2005, from: www.w3.org/TR/2001/REC-xmlschema-0-20010502, downloaded pages 1-67, [hereinafter "XML Schema"], and further in view of W3C, "XML Schema Requirements, W3C Note 15 February 1999," last downloaded by the Examiner on December 19, 2005, from: www.w3.org/TR/NOTE-xml-schema-req, downloaded pages 1-5, [hereinafter "XML Requirements"].

Claim 2 is allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

Claims 3-6 are allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 2. Moreover, claim 6 as amended recites the application itself includes file information among the contents of the document without using text supplied by a user. Ayers, XML Schema, and XML Requirements, nor the Official Notice, do not singly, or in any motivated combination do not teach or suggest the application itself including file information among the contents of the document without using text supplied by a user. Instead, the auto-archive and save file functions merely saves the entire file without any distinction as to the source of the text. This is significant because the cited references do not determine field properties from an application document using a file format that is specific to the application.

With respect to claim 11, the cited art does not teach or suggest, either singly or in motivated combination, fields that comprise unique properties are defined by the application. Instead the cited art teaches, for example, formatting of user-supplied text. This is significant

because information such as “author,” “file-creation date,” auto fill-in forms, and the like cannot be stored in the file itself (and such information could be lost when transferring the file to another operating system, for example).

Claim 11 is also allowable because while the file can be read by any text editor, the text editor cannot parse or “understand” the XML code as discussed above. Moreover, the text editors cannot determine the unique properties, map the determined properties, and store the mapped properties as recited by the claim.

Claims 12-18 are allowable for the reasons given for claim 11.

Claim 19 is allowable because the cited art fails to teach or suggest, either singly or in motivated combination, fields that comprise unique properties are defined by the application, as recited by the amended claim. Instead, the cited art teaches, for example, formatting of user-supplied text. This is significant because information such as “author,” “file-creation date,” auto fill-in forms, and the like cannot be stored in the file itself (and such information could be lost when transferring the file to another operating system, for example).

Claim 19 is also allowable because while the file can be read by any text editor, the text editor cannot parse or “understand” the XML code as discussed above. Moreover, the text editors cannot determine the unique properties, map the determined properties, and store the mapped properties as recited by the claim.

Claims 20-23 are allowable for the reasons given for claim 11.

App. No. 10/731,515
Amendment Dated December 26, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of June 26, 2006

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicants at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Frank J. Bozzo
Registration No. 36,756
Direct Dial: 206.342.6294

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

